

Serial No. 10/029,801

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 19, 20 and 37-39 have been cancelled, and claims 15, 23, 26, 29, 36 and 47 have been amended. Claims 15, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, 36 and 40-47 are pending and under consideration.

Claims 15, 19, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 36-39 41, 45 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,313,838 to Deering. Claims 40, 42, 44 and 46 are separately rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Deering.

The Deering reference calculates a processing time. If the processing time is too great, then "equation (15) may be utilized to determine if the frame will be fill rate bound or polygon overhead bound (step 326)." See column 25, lines 35 and 36. If the frame is polygon bound, then rendering parameters are modified to reduce the numbers of polygons. If the frame is fill rate bound, then the method modifies rendering parameters to reduce the number of pixels.

With regard to claim 15, for example, although the Examiner asserts that Deering discloses all of the elements of this claim, applicant disagrees. For example, the Examiner cites column 19, lines 31-38 which seem to have nothing to do with "information including influencing characteristics that each parameter gives influence to the job on a processing transition of a processing example that is desirable for the user," as claimed. Also, column 25 lines 33-52 only disclose that if the calculated rendering time is too slow to meet the desired frame rate, then equation 15 is used to determine if the frame is fill rate bound or polygon overhead bound. Depending on the result, the number of polygons is reduced or the number of pixels is reduced, as described above. However, column 15, lines 33-52 do not in any way disclose comparing the transition of the reference calculation time formed based on the processing time of the previously conducted processing, which is designated as desirable to the user, with that of the current rendering processing and deciding whether the job is a processing suitable for the user. If the processing is not suitable for the user, the candidate parameter for correction is identified. This candidate parameter may be a parameter having a difference in the influencing characteristic for the current rendering processing and the influencing characteristic for the processing example.

Although the claims are not restricted to what is disclosed in the specification, the Examiner is referred to Fig. 14, for example. In Fig. 14, the parameters are shown in the left column. The influencing characteristics are shown in the right column. If increasing the parameter works to increase the rendering calculation time, then a +1 is shown as the

Serial No. 10/029,801

influencing characteristic. If increasing the parameter works to decrease the calculation, then a -1 is shown as the influencing characteristic. See page 14 of the specification. According to one example, the parameter to be modified is the parameter for which there is a disagreement between the influencing characteristic for the sample job and the influencing characteristic for the actual job.

Independent claims 15 and 29 now recite that the influencing characteristic may include an average processing time for processing predetermined number of number frames for each parameter. The influencing characteristic may also include whether there is an increase or a decrease in the processing time of each frame with respect to a processing time of a immediately preceding frame, for each parameter. The other independent claims contain similar limitations.

Deering uses equation 15 to determine which rendering parameters should be modified. The present invention identifies candidate parameters for correction based on a difference between an influencing characteristic for a sample job and an influencing characteristic for a current job. Deering does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, the prior art rejections should be withdrawn.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early allowance to that effect is courtesy solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS &amp; HALSEY LLP

Date:

Dec 29 2005

By:

Mark J. Henry

Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being  
transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for  
Trademarks  
on Dec 29 .2005

By: STAAS & HALSEY LLPDate: 12-29-05